

1997-98 SESSION  
COMMITTEE HEARING  
RECORDS

Committee Name:

Joint Committee on  
Finance (JC-Fi)

Sample:

Record of Comm. Proceedings ... RCP

- 05hrAC-EdR\_RCP\_pt01a
- 05hrAC-EdR\_RCP\_pt01b
- 05hrAC-EdR\_RCP\_pt02

➤ Appointments ... Appt

➤ \*\*

➤ Clearinghouse Rules ... CRule

➤ \*\*

➤ Committee Hearings ... CH

➤ \*\*

➤ Committee Reports ... CR

➤ \*\*

➤ Executive Sessions ... ES

➤ \*\*

➤ Hearing Records ... HR

➤ \*\*

➤ Miscellaneous ... Misc

➤ 97hrJC-Fi\_Misc\_pt96a\_LFB

➤ Record of Comm. Proceedings ... RCP

➤ \*\*

# Public Instruction

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 461)

## LFB Summary Items for Which Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
20	Residential Schools -- Maintenance Funding (Paper #650)
26	Minor Policy and Technical Changes -- Residential Schools - Housing Maintenance (Paper #651)
14	Supplies and Services and Unspecified Budget Reductions (Paper #652)
37	Technical Modifications: Restore Statutory References to Department of Public Instruction (Paper #653)
28	High School Graduation Examination (Paper #654)
2,3	State Support for Elementary and Secondary Education (Paper #655)
4	General Equalization Aids -- Procedure for Setting Funding Level (Paper #656)
5	Two-Thirds Rather than 66.7% State Support (Paper #657)
-	School District Revenue Limits -- School Districts with Changes in Pupil Enrollments (Paper #658)
2	School District Revenue Limits - Maximum Allowable Revenue Increase (Paper #659)
2	School District Revenue Limits -- Carryover of Unused Revenue Authority (Paper #660)
11	School District Revenue Limits-- Low Revenue Adjustment (Paper #661)
2	School District Revenue Limits -- Transfer of Service (Paper #662)
2	School District Debt Service Costs (Paper #663)
-	Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (Paper #664)
2	School Tax Levy Credit (Paper #665)
-	Aid for School Districts With Low-Income Students (Paper #666)
7	State Tuition Payments Reestimate (Paper #667)
47	Transfer of Certain School-to-Work Programs to DWD (Paper #668)
46	Transfer of Certain AODA Programs from DPI to DHFS (Paper #669)
32	Charter Schools -- Creation by Other Entities in the MPS District (Paper #670)
33,34&35	Charter Schools -- Statewide Changes (Paper #671)
30&31	Minor Policy and Technical Changes -- Postsecondary Enrollment Options Program (Paper #672)
30	Postsecondary Enrollment Options Program -- UW and Private Colleges (Paper #673)
31	Postsecondary Enrollment Options Program for Pupils Attending Technical Colleges (Paper #674)
-	Reestimate of GPR Revenue from MA Reimbursement for School Based Services (Paper #675)
10	School Library Aids -- Distribution of Income from the Common School Fund (see Paper #792)

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### Residential Schools -- Maintenance Funding (DPI)

[LFB Summary: Page 470, #20]

## CURRENT LAW

Annual base funding allocated to maintenance projects is \$121,500 GPR at the School for the Deaf and \$89,000 GPR at the School for the Visually Handicapped.

## GOVERNOR

Provide \$91,200 GPR annually for maintenance at the residential schools. Require the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to submit plans to the Secretary of DOA by October 1, 1997, and by October 1, 1998, specifying how the State Superintendent would allocate: (a) \$74,000 annually to fund maintenance projects at the School for the Deaf; and (b) \$17,200 annually for maintenance projects at the School for the Visually Handicapped. Direct that these amounts of funding would have to be allocated for maintenance projects, but that the funding could not be expended or encumbered until the required annual plan would be approved by the Secretary of DOA.

## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Last year, the Department of Administration directed DPI to allocate additional funding for facility upkeep and repairs at each school. As part of its agency budget submission, DPI requested, and the Governor recommended, \$91,200 GPR annually for maintenance at the residential schools. SB 77, when combined with base funding, would provide annual

maintenance budgets of \$195,500 GPR at the School for the Deaf and \$106,200 GPR at the School for the Visually Handicapped.

2. DPI working with the Division of Facilities Development in DOA developed the request that was approved by the Governor. The \$91,200 GPR annually would be used, in part, to purchase new or updated tools, compressor replacements, HVAC parts, air conditioning repairs and upgrades, chemicals and supplies for lawn maintenance, floor buffers and polishers, fire alarm controls and sensors, tree removal and contractual services.

3. The residential schools Director supports the bill provision that requires DPI to receive DOA approval prior to spending the increased funds. However, it could be argued that if DPI staff require additional assistance in allocating the recommended increases, DOA staff could be contacted for advice without the requirement to submit plans. Using this reasoning, the Committee could delete the requirement that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction submit plans to the Secretary of DOA by October 1, 1997, and by October 1, 1998, specifying how the State Superintendent would allocate the increased maintenance funds.

4. As indicated, DPI currently has base funding allocated for the upkeep and repairs at each school and spends this funding without receiving DOA approval. However, in the past, certain decisions were made to transfer some of this base funding for uses other than maintenance projects. The current Director of the residential schools, who was hired this past year, indicates that the base amounts and recommended SB 77 increases would be used for maintenance projects.

## ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$91,200 GPR annually for maintenance at the residential schools and to require the State Superintendent to submit annual plans to the Secretary of DOA on how this funding would be allocated.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$182,400
[Change to Bill]	\$0]

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by requiring the State Superintendent to submit the annual plans specifying how to allocate \$195,500 GPR at the School for the Deaf and \$106,200 GPR at the School for the Visually Handicapped. This would require DPI to submit plans for the total annual maintenance budgets for each residential school, instead of just the SB 77 increases.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$182,400
[Change to Bill]	\$0]

3. Modify the Governor's recommendation by deleting the requirement that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction submit plans to the Secretary of DOA by October 1, 1997, and by October 1, 1998, specifying how the State Superintendent would allocate the maintenance funds.

<u>Alternative 3</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$182,400
[Change to Bill]	\$0]

4. Maintain current law.

<u>Alternative 4</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$0
[Change to Bill]	- \$182,400]

Prepared by: Bob Soldner

MO# \_\_\_\_\_

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ ABS \_\_\_\_\_

*see motion # 3221*

Senator Burke  
Representative Jensen

# PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

## Residential Schools Maintenance Funding

Motion:

Move that the \$182,400 GPR of LFB Paper #650 be placed in the Joint Committee on Finance appropriation for release by the Committee upon approval of a report by the State Superintendent.

MO# 3221

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### Minor Policy and Technical Changes -- Residential Schools - Housing Maintenance (Public Instruction)

[LFB Summary: Page 472, #26]

## GOVERNOR

Reduce funding by \$4,000 PR annually from the 1996-97 base level of \$5,300 PR. This funding is used to maintain a house on the grounds of the School for the Visually Handicapped, which was unoccupied.

## MODIFICATION

Adjust the Governor's recommendation by \$5,800 annually, which would represent a change to the adjusted base of \$1,800 annually. As a result, the School for the Visually Handicapped's maintenance budget for the house would be reestimated to \$7,100 annually.

**Explanation:** The amounts in the bill do not reflect the lease agreement that went into effect on March 1, 1997. The house is currently occupied by the School's Superintendent.

<u>Modification</u>	<u>PR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$3,600
[Change to Bill]	\$11,600]

Prepared by: Bob Soldner

PAPER  
# 651

MO# Modification

Z JENSEN	X	N	A
OURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
GARD	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A
LINTON	X	N	A
COGGS	X	N	A

BURKE	X	N	A
DECKER	X	N	A
GEORGE	X	N	A
JAUCH	X	N	A
WINEKE	X	N	A
SHIBILSKI	X	N	A
COWLES	X	N	A
PANZER	X	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### **Supplies and Services and Unspecified Budget Reductions (DPI)**

[LFB Summary: Page 468-69, #14]

## CURRENT LAW

The Department of Public Instruction (DPI) has \$11,172,600 GPR of annual base funding for department general program operations, of which \$2,620,600 GPR is allocated for supplies and services. Additionally, the state's residential schools (the Wisconsin School for the Visually Handicapped and the Wisconsin School for the Deaf) have annual base funding of \$9,347,100 GPR, of which \$745,900 GPR is allocated for supplies and services.

## GOVERNOR

Reduce the agency's general program operations appropriation by \$491,600 GPR annually. Of the total reduction, delete \$102,000 GPR annually from the agency's general program operations supplies and services base budget. Require that DPI submit a report to the Governor and the Joint Committee on Finance by October 1, 1997, concerning the agency's preference for allocating the remaining \$389,600 annual reduction among the agency's sum certain GPR appropriations.

## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Under 1995 Act 27 (1995-97 state budget), DPI's base operating GPR budget was reduced by a total of \$6,044,700 and 99.22 positions in 1996-97 from the 1994-95 adjusted base. These reductions were accomplished by significant cuts, including: (a) a 29.8% reduction in

funding for DPI's overall general program operations; (b) a 13.4% reduction in funding for residential schools general program operations; (c) a 33% reduction in educational assessment funding; and (d) a 10% reduction in funding for minority group pupil scholarships. Additionally, the position reductions totalled 23.2% of DPI's base GPR positions. Excluding the state's residential schools, DPI's general program operations position authority was reduced by 69.8 GPR positions, or 33.8% in 1996-97, compared to the 1994-95 base.

2. Of the 1996-97 reductions, \$2,238,800 and 43.93 positions were specified by Act 27, and the remaining \$3,805,900 and 55.29 positions were unspecified reductions. DPI was required to report to the Joint Committee on Finance with a recommendation for how these additional reductions should be allocated. The Committee was required to approve or modify DPI's recommendations.

3. The proposed funding reduction in the 1997-99 budget bill is presented in the executive budget book as a budget efficiency measure and as a means to increase efficiency and reduce state government costs overall. Staff from DOA indicate that they believe DPI could achieve efficiencies through taking the full reductions from the agency and residential schools supplies and services budget, but have allowed the State Superintendent to indicate his preference for these reductions. However, it is unclear what efficiencies would remain to be achieved by DPI after budget reductions of the magnitude of those imposed in Act 27.

4. Staff from DPI indicate that while a budget reduction plan for the proposed funding reductions has not been determined, it is estimated that the \$491,600 annual reduction would result in the loss of approximately 7.0 GPR positions. A preliminary allocation of this funding reduction would eliminate one position from each of the four state operations divisions, which are Learning Support Instructional Services; Libraries and Community Learning; Finance and Management; and Learning Support Equity and Advocacy. In addition, three positions would be eliminated at the state's residential schools.

5. Under the bill, DPI would have 31 sum certain GPR appropriations from which it could allocate the proposed reductions under the bill. These appropriations include the following categories:

a. Twenty school aid appropriations, including equalization aids and categorical aids, which would be counted as part of the state's commitment to fund two-thirds of school district costs. In 1996-97, these aid appropriations totalled \$3,530,418,900.

b. Six appropriations would be for aids to individuals and organizations, including aids to public library systems, library service contracts, the youth village program, Very Special Arts, the Special Olympics and minority group pupil scholarships. The 1996-97 funding for these appropriations totalled \$13,919,300.

c. Five appropriations would be for funding state agency operations and programs, including general program operations for both the Department and the state residential schools, energy costs, and the educational and pupil assessment program. The 1996-97 funding for these appropriations totalled \$22,734,300.

6. In the budget reductions instructions submitted to agencies in October, 1996, that required agencies to submit plans to reduce their budgets by 3.5%, DOA indicated that local assistance aids should not be included in agency reduction plans. Therefore, staff from DOA indicate that this proposed reduction should not include local school aids.

7. In their 3.5% reduction plan submitted to DOA in November, 1996, DPI indicated that it would take reductions from the supplies and services budget of all four divisions, the state's residential schools, the State Superintendent's office and pupil assessment programs, and aids to individuals and organizations under the Special Olympics, Very Special Arts, minority pupil scholarships, Youth Village and library service contracts.

8. Although DPI has indicated that it would not request to take the proposed funding reductions from any of the 20 school aid appropriations, it may be desirable to specify that these appropriations would not be subject to the unallocated reductions, due to their part in the two-thirds funding of school districts.

9. The bill would not establish a formal review mechanism for the Committee to review the proposed report by DPI concerning the allocation of the unspecified portion of the agency funding reduction. On similar provisions relating to the Arts Board and Historical Society, the Committee voted to require that the report be subject to the approval of the Committee under a 14-day passive review. The bill could be modified to provide that DPI could identify a proposed allocation of the funding reductions, subject to JFC approval under a passive 14-day review process.

## ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to reduce DPI's base budget by \$491,600 GPR annually.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$983,200
[Change to Bill]	\$0

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by: (a) specifying that no reduction could be made from the 20 appropriations for school aids; and (b) providing that DPI would have to

identify a proposed allocation of the funding reductions, subject to JFC approval under a passive 14-day review process.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>GPR</u>
<b>1997-99 FUNDING</b> (Change to Base)	- \$983,200
[Change to Bill]	\$0]

3. Maintain current law.

<u>Alternative 3</u>	<u>GPR</u>
<b>1997-99 FUNDING</b> (Change to Base)	\$0
[Change to Bill]	\$983,200]

Prepared by: Ruth Hardy

MO# Alt #2

2 JENSEN	Y	N	A
1 OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

*Withdrawn*  
*see # Motion 3240*

AYE \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ ABS \_\_\_\_\_

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Motion:

Move to reduce DPI's base budget by \$245,800 GPR annually.

Note:

This motion would restore 50% of the funding reduction to DPI that is proposed in SB 77.

[Change to Base: -\$491,600 GPR]

[Change to Bill: \$491,600 GPR]

MO#

3240

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
2 HARDSORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
1 KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<del>N</del>	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<del>N</del>	A

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<del>N</del>	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<del>N</del>	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 11 NO 5 ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

**Technical Modifications: Restore Statutory References to Department of Public Instruction (DPI)**

[LFB Summary: Page 487, #37]

## GOVERNOR

Restore the statutory references to Department of Public Instruction (DPI) and the powers of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Delete references to the Department of Education (DOE), the Secretary of Education and a separate Office of State Superintendent outside of DOE.

## MODIFICATION TO BASE

Modify SB 77 to include correct statutory references to accomplish the intent of the bill.

**Explanation:** The bill inadvertently does not affect all of the statutory sections that require modifications.

Prepared by: Ruth Hardy

MO#	Modification to Base					
JENSEN	Y	N	A	BURKE	Y	N A
LOURADA	Y	N	A	DECKER	Y	N A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A	GEORGE	Y	N A
ALBERS	Y	N	A	JAUCH	Y	N A
GARD	Y	N	A	WINEKE	Y	N A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A	SHIBILSKI	Y	N A
LINTON	Y	N	A	COWLES	Y	N A
COGGS	Y	N	A	PANZER	Y	N A
				AYE	16	NO 0 ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### High School Graduation Examination (DPI)

[LFB Summary: Page 473, #28]

## CURRENT LAW

Under current law, all school districts are required to administer four standardized examinations, including the Wisconsin reading comprehension test (WRCT) in third grade, and the fourth-, eighth- and tenth-grade knowledge and concepts examinations. The WRCT is an objective-referenced (scored in comparison to a minimum standard) test developed by the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) which is given to third grade pupils in the Spring of each year in order to: (a) identify marginal readers who may need remediation; (b) provide comparative performance data by school and school district; and (c) allow school districts to evaluate their reading programs.

The WRCT is comprised of four types of questions based on four narrative or expository writing passages: (a) prior knowledge; (b) reading strategies; (c) multiple choice; and (d) short answer questions included on a pilot basis. The exam, which includes 105 to 110 questions, is taken over four testing sessions within three weeks. Test scores for the reading comprehension questions are placed into three performance categories: partially proficient, proficient and advanced. WRCT exam questions are developed by Wisconsin teachers in conjunction with Metritech, the contractor for WRCT development.

Each school district in the state is required to administer the fourth-, eighth- and tenth-grade knowledge and concepts examinations, which are designed to evaluate the level of knowledge attained by pupils in the areas of mathematics, science, social studies, reading and language arts. The exams consist of multiple choice, short answer and essay questions; in addition, each test contains a non-academic section consisting of questions related to the pupil's

career interests, intended to aid in pupil guidance counseling and course selection. The tests require approximately six hours to complete and are generally administered over a three-day period.

The knowledge and concepts exams are not specifically linked to the curriculum and pupil performance is not measured against a minimum standard. In order to facilitate comparisons between schools and districts, DPI has designed a grand composite score which is equal to the sum of the total scores on each portion of the test. The Department currently administers the exams through a three-year contract with CTB/McGraw-Hill.

The knowledge and concepts exams are required, to the extent possible, to be free from bias. School boards can decide not to examine limited English-speaking (LES) and exceptional educational needs (EEN) pupils, or can modify the format to administer the tests to these pupils. In addition, any 4th, 8th or 10th grade pupil may be excused from taking the tests upon request of the pupil's parent or guardian.

## **GOVERNOR**

Specify that if the Governor issues pupil academic standards by executive order, DPI would be required to develop a high school graduation examination designed to measure whether pupils meet the academic standards. Provide \$500,000 GPR in 1997-98 and \$850,000 GPR in 1998-99 for the development of the proposed high school graduation exam. Direct each school district to adopt a high school graduation exam that is designed to measure whether pupils meet the standards adopted by the school board. If a school board adopts the standards issued by the executive order, the school board could adopt the high school graduation exam developed by DPI. A school board would have to notify DPI if it adopts its own graduation exam.

Require each school board that operates a high school to administer the high school graduation test adopted by the board at least twice each school year beginning in the 1999-2000 school year. The school board would be required to determine in which high school grades the exam would be administered each school year. Beginning on September 1, 2001, a school board could not grant a high school diploma to any pupil unless the pupil has passed the high school graduation exam. School boards would have to provide pupils with at least four opportunities in the high school grades to take the exam.

## **DISCUSSION POINTS**

1. By executive order in January, 1997, the Governor created the Governor's Council on Model Academic Standards which consists of the Lieutenant Governor who serves as chair, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the chairs and ranking minority members of the Senate and Assembly Education Committees and one public member appointed by the Governor.

The Council has been meeting to develop academic standards for all pupils in English language arts, mathematics, science and social studies at grades 4, 8 and 12. The Council must submit an interim report to the Governor by June 15, 1997, and a final report recommending the standards by September 15, 1997. If the Governor approves of the standards recommended by the Council, he could issue the standards by executive order. School boards could adopt these standards or issue their own standards.

2. Since its inception in January, 1997, the Council has gathered public testimony and is currently working in committees that have been formed dealing with each of the four academic areas. Committee members include school district, higher education, business, community group and state agency representatives. While input into the development of the standards has been broad, it may be desirable to include a provision for legislative oversight over the final standards issued by the Governor. The Committee could require that the standards be reviewed and approved by the Senate and Assembly Education Committees before DPI could develop the high school graduation exam based on the academic standards.

3. DPI indicates that it would not make decisions regarding the development of the high school graduation exam until after the Governor issues the academic standards; however, DPI expects to form several committees to develop the exam, including: (a) graduation test steering; (b) testing policy advisory; (c) bias review; (d) technical advisory; (e) discipline specific content review; (f) general content review; and (g) proficiency standard-setting. DPI believes the committee structure is essential to assure that the program is designed and conducted consistent with the values and beliefs of Wisconsin's citizens, and to guarantee that the program and tests meet the highest level of technical and content quality.

DPI estimates that the test would be approximately five hours long, with multiple choice, short answer and essay questions. The agency would prepare the exam in multiple forms in order to allow pupils to retake it up to four times prior to graduation. Pupils would be required to reach a single passing score in order to successfully complete the exam. DPI believes that by requiring pupils to pass an exam covering the academic standards would motivate parents, pupils and educators to improve the quality of instruction and effort directed toward learning.

4. The major costs of test development in the next biennium include administration and coordination (\$175,000); test content specification development (\$125,000) to determine the portions of the academic standards that would be measured by the high school exam; item specification development (\$125,000) to determine the specific skills to be measured in each content area; item development (\$400,000) to develop the specific questions in each academic area; and field tryouts (\$225,000) to pilot the examination in certain high schools around the state. DPI would develop the graduation exam in coordination with a contractor, through an arrangement parallel to that of the WRCT and knowledge and concepts exams. Given the magnitude of developing a statewide exam based on specific standards, the proposed funding level appears reasonable.

5. Proponents of the Governor's proposal to create and require a high school graduation exam contend that in order for Wisconsin to remain competitive in the 21st century, Wisconsin high school graduates must be able to demonstrate their knowledge and skills based on high standards across core academic subjects. A high school graduation exam would establish that a Wisconsin high school diploma would ensure a high quality graduate that is prepared for higher education, a competitive job market or community service. Further, because the proposal requires high schools to allow pupils to attempt the exam four times, pupils would have several opportunities to improve their performance and pass the exam.

6. Opponents of a high school examination requirement argue that such an exam would be expensive to develop and would provide little specific information about the skills or knowledge of a high school graduate in Wisconsin. They believe that pupils in Wisconsin are already tested more than necessary and that such testing contributes to: (a) inequitable tracking; (b) gender, racial, disability and income bias; (c) teachers that teach to the exam rather than for broad knowledge in a subject area; (d) school hours spent on testing rather than instruction; and (e) unfounded comparisons between the quality of school districts across the state that focus on a narrow measurement of success.

7. Further, opponents contend that such a high-stakes examination may encourage EEN, LES and marginal pupils to drop out of high school, rather than fail an examination and be denied a high school diploma. It would be a great disadvantage to a pupil, to enter the workforce without a high school degree because he or she is unable to pass this exam, even though the pupil may have been diligent in his or her course of study. Opponents to the proposal argue that the decision to award a high school diploma should not be focused on one isolated performance, but rather include a broad array of pupil performance indicators, such as grade point average, general test scores, extracurricular activities and behavioral indicators. In a letter to the Co-Chairs of the Joint Committee on Finance dated April 24, 1997, the Senate Education Committee indicated that the Committee has concerns regarding the exam as a requirement of high school graduation, and has proposed that the high school graduation exam be taken out of SB 77.

8. Recent federal legislation in the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA), requires that states develop statewide pupil academic standards and pupil assessments that are linked to the academic standards. Wisconsin's current assessment program for 3rd, 4th, 8th and 10th grade pupils, as well as the academic standards currently being developed will likely meet most of the federal requirements. However, DPI indicates that the state must make progress in including LES and EEN pupils in assessments, because federal law requires that all pupils, including EEN and LES pupils, be taught the same knowledge and skills and be held to the same high standards. There may be a conflict with the goals of requiring a high school graduation exam and holding EEN and LES pupils to the same high standards as other pupils, while at the same time striving to award these pupils high school degrees.

9. DPI has developed statewide guidelines for including LES and EEN pupils in the current examinations in a manner that encourages high standards and skills for these pupils, while also providing incentives for passing the examinations. These guidelines include methods for providing the exam in alternate formats or under differing circumstances.

10. If the goal of the pupil academic standards and high school graduation exam is to ensure a high level of achievement across the state of Wisconsin and to establish that a high school diploma is a valuable indicator of graduate skills and knowledge, it may be beneficial to require the same high school graduation exam statewide in order to provide a standard measurement of pupil knowledge. Further, this might benefit institutions of higher education and potential employers when comparing high school graduates from varying regions of the state. The Committee may wish to require school districts to adopt the high school examination that would be developed by DPI based on the academic standards issued by the Governor, rather than develop a district-specific examination.

11. Under current law, upon the request of a parent or guardian, a school board can excuse a pupil for completing the 4th, 8th and 10th grade exams. This provision is included for parents who may have medical, personal or religious reasons for not requiring their children to take a standardized examination. The Committee may wish to include this provision for the high school graduation exam as well, and require school boards to establish alternate criteria upon which to determine qualification for high school graduation if a pupil has been excused from the high school graduation exam.

12. Beginning in the 1999-2000 school year, every high school would be required to administer a high school graduation exam. School districts would be required to give pupils four opportunities to take the exam before graduation and would likely administer the exam in the 10th, 11th or 12th grades. DPI indicates that the graduation exam may serve the same purposes that the 10th grade knowledge and concepts exam currently serves. Because the graduation exam would be required for graduation beginning on September 1, 2000, the Committee may wish to consider sunsetting the current 10th grade exam on June 30, 2001.

## ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to establish a high school graduation examination, which would begin to be administered in the 1999-2000 school year. Provide \$500,000 in 1997-98 and \$850,000 in 1998-99 for the development of the proposed exam.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$1,350,000
[Change to Bill]	\$0]

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation through one or more of the following:

a. Require that the academic standards that would be issued by the Governor must be reviewed and approved by the Senate and Assembly Education Committees before DPI could develop the high school graduation exam based on these academic standards.

b. Require school districts to adopt the high school graduation examination that would be developed by DPI based on the academic standards issued by the Governor, rather than develop a district-specific examination.

c. Require school boards to excuse a pupil from the high school graduation exam upon the request of a parent or guardian. Specify that school boards must establish alternate criteria upon which to determine qualification for high school graduation if a pupil has been excused from the high school graduation exam.

d. Sunset the current 10th grade exam on June 30, 2001.

Alternative 2

GPR

1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$1,350,000
[Change to Bill]	\$0]

3. Maintain current law.

Alternative 3

GPR

1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$0
[Change to Bill]	- \$1,350,000]

Prepared by: Ruth Hardy

MO# ALP\*2a,c,d

JENSEN	X	N	A
OURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
GARD	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

1 BURKE	X	N	A
2 DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	X	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	X	N	A
PANZER	X	N	A

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### State Support for Elementary and Secondary Education (DPI)

[LFB Summary: Page 461, #2 and Page 464, #3]

## CURRENT LAW

Under the provisions of 1995 Act 27, state support for elementary and secondary (K-12) education increases from \$3.032 billion in 1995-96 to \$4.035 billion in 1996-97. The purpose of this increase in state funding is to fulfill the commitment established in 1993 Act 437 to raise the state's average share of K-12 revenues to 66.7%, thereby significantly reducing the reliance on local property taxes to fund K-12 education. The two-thirds funding commitment is calculated on a statewide basis; the level of state aid received by an individual district may be higher or lower than 66.7%, depending on the district's per member shared costs and equalized value.

The statutes define both the numerator and denominator of the two-thirds state funding calculation. The numerator is the sum of state school aids, composed of 25 separate general and categorical aid appropriations, and the school levy tax credit. The denominator, which is called "partial revenues," is the sum of state school aids and property taxes levied for school districts.

The 1995-97 budget established a process for annually determining the amount necessary in the general equalization aid appropriation to meet the statutorily defined two-thirds funding level. Each year by June 15, the Departments of Public Instruction and Administration and the Legislative Fiscal Bureau must jointly certify to the Joint Committee on Finance an estimate of the amount necessary in the general equalization aid appropriation which, in combination with the amounts provided in the other state aid and levy credit appropriations, would achieve the 66.7% funding level in the following school year. Annually, by June 30 the Committee must determine the amount to be appropriated in the following school year. For 1996-97, the Committee met on June 27, 1996, and approved an additional \$30 million over the funding level

contained in the 1995-97 budget, which was the amount estimated in June that was needed to achieve the 66.7% funding goal.

## GOVERNOR

Increase the total amount appropriated for general and categorical school aids from \$3,566,051,400 in 1996-97 to \$3,775,209,000 in 1997-98 and \$3,869,443,100 in 1998-99. Compared to the 1996-97 base year, school aids would increase by \$209,157,600 in 1997-98 and \$303,391,700 in 1998-99 (or \$94,234,100 over the 1997-98 recommended level). These proposed funding levels would represent annual increases over the prior year of 5.9% in 1997-98 and 2.5% in 1998-99. These amounts include increases of \$191,945,400 in 1997-98 and \$266,186,000 in 1998-99 for general equalization aids. Total equalization aid funding would increase from \$3,182,215,800 in 1996-97 to \$3,374,161,200 (6.0%) in 1997-98 and \$3,448,401,800 (2.2%) in 1998-99.

Establish the distribution amount for the 1999 school levy property tax credit at \$569,305,000 or \$100,000,000 over the 1997 and 1998 funding level of \$469,305,000. The higher amount would affect property taxes levied in 1998 (payable in 1999), but would be paid by the state in fiscal year 1999-2000.

The administration estimated that the bill would provide two-thirds state funding of partial school revenues in the 1997-99 biennium. The bill would increase state funding from the base amount of \$4,035,356,400 in 1996-97 to \$4,244,514,000 in 1997-98 and \$4,438,748,100 in 1998-99. Compared to the 1996-97 base year, state funding would increase by \$209,157,600 in 1997-98 and \$403,391,700 in 1998-99 (or \$194,234,100 over 1997-98). These funding increases would represent annual increases over the prior year of 5.2% in 1997-98 and 4.6% in 1998-99. A summary of these funding amounts with the administration's estimates of partial school revenues is presented in the table below.

### State Support for K-12 Education (\$ in Millions)

	<u>1996-97</u>	<u>1997-98</u>		<u>1998-99</u>	
		<u>Amount</u>	<u>Increase</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Increase</u>
State Funding:					
General Aid	\$3,184.5	\$3,376.5	\$192.0	\$3,450.7	\$74.2
Categorical Aid	381.6	398.7	17.1	418.7	20.0
School Levy Tax Credit	<u>469.3</u>	<u>469.3</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>569.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Total	\$4,035.4	\$4,244.5	\$209.1	\$4,438.7	\$194.2
Partial School Revenues	\$6,094.1	\$6,366.7	\$242.6	\$6,658.1	\$291.4
State Share	66.22%	66.67%		66.67%	

## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. SB 77 would provide \$4,244.5 million in 1997-98 and \$4,438.7 million for 1998-99. Based on current estimates of projected K-12 partial revenues, it is estimated that an additional \$23.1 million in 1997-98 and \$33.3 million in 1998-99 of equalization aids funding would be needed to meet the two-thirds goal, for a total of \$56.4 million in the 1997-99 biennium.

2. Two factors contribute to this higher estimate. First, the amount of per pupil revenues allowed to school districts under state revenue limits is higher than that used in SB 77, which accounts for approximately 60% of the increased cost. Second, the remaining 40% of the additional cost is attributable to higher estimates of the debt levy for school district borrowing.

3. The level of state support for K-12 education, measured as a percentage of partial school revenues, has been almost 50% or more each year during the last four years. Specifically, it has been 48.4% in 1993-94, 51.0% in 1994-95, 52.9% in 1995-96 and estimated to be 66.2% in 1996-97. The Committee could repeal the current law 66.7% funding goal and appropriate, on a sum certain basis, the amounts in SB 77, which would provide an estimated 66.31% in 1997-98 and 66.17% in 1998-99 of partial school revenues.

4. School district revenue limits are defined as a limit on the amount of revenue obtained through the combination of general school aids and the property tax levy. General school aids consist of the following (as they apply to a particular school district): (a) equalization aid; (b) integration (Chapter 220) aid; and (c) special adjustment (hold harmless) aid. In total, these aids represent nearly 90% of the funds provided as state aid to school districts.

5. Under revenue limits, any decrease in the amount of equalization aids could be offset with an increase in the property tax levy. It is anticipated that most school districts would increase the property tax levy to offset any loss of state aids.

## ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$191,945,400 in 1997-98 and \$266,186,000 in 1998-99 compared to the base year for general equalization aids. It is estimated that SB 77 would provide 66.31% in 1997-98 and 66.17% in 1998-99 of partial school revenues.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$458,131,400
[Change to Bill]	\$0]

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by providing an additional \$23,100,000 in 1997-98 and \$33,300,000 in 1998-99 for general equalization aids. It is estimated that this would provide two-thirds of partial school revenues in each year of the biennium.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$514,531,400
[Change to Bill]	\$56,400,000]

3. Maintain the base funding level of \$3,182,215,800 annually, eliminate the current law goal of 66.7% of partial school revenues and provide the funds on an annual sum certain basis. This would represent a reduction of \$191,945,400 in 1997-98 and \$266,186,000 in 1998-99 from the bill. It is estimated that this would provide 63.31% in 1997-98 and 62.20% in 1998-99 of partial school revenues.

<u>Alternative 3</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$0
[Change to Bill]	- \$458,131,400]

Prepared by: Bob Soldner

MO# AH#2

JENSEN	X	N	A
ZOURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
GARD	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A
LINTON	X	N	A
COGGS	X	N	A

BURKE	X	N	A
DECKER	X	N	A
GEORGE	X	N	A
JAUCH	X	N	A
WINEKE	X	N	A
SHIBILSKI	X	N	A
COWLES	X	N	A
PANZER	X	N	A

AYE 14 NO 2 ABS

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Eliminate 66.7% Funding Requirement

Motion:

Move to delete current law that establishes a funding goal of 66.7% of partial school revenues and, instead provide equalization funding at the level otherwise approved in an annual sum certain appropriation.

MO# 3241

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COGGS	Y	<del>N</del>	A

BURKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
DECKER	Y	<del>N</del>	A
2 GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	Y	<del>N</del>	A
1 WINEKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COWLES	Y	<del>N</del>	A
PANZER	Y	<del>N</del>	A

AYE 2 NO 14 ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### **General Equalization Aids -- Procedure for Setting Funding Level (DPI)**

[LFB Summary: Page 464, #4]

## CURRENT LAW

Annually, by each June 15, the Department's of Public Instruction and Administration and the Legislative Fiscal Bureau must jointly certify to the Joint Committee on Finance (JFC) an estimate of the amount necessary in the equalization aid appropriation. This funding amount must be sufficient, when combined with categorical school aid appropriations and the school levy tax credit, to achieve an estimated 66.7% of partial school revenues in the following school year. By June 30 of each year, JFC must approve the amount to appropriate as equalization aid. Partial school revenues are defined as the sum of state school aids, which includes the general and categorical aid programs, and gross property taxes levied for school districts.

The equalization aid appropriation is a sum sufficient appropriation that is set equal to the amount approved by JFC each year.

## GOVERNOR

Modify the current equalization aid appropriation from a sum sufficient to an annual sum certain. Delete the current statutory procedure for establishing the funding level for equalization aid. Instead, provide that by February 15, 1999, and biennially thereafter, the Governor would submit an estimate to JFC of the amount needed in the following biennium to ensure that the sum of state school aids and the school levy tax credit equals two-thirds of partial school revenues.

## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. On June 14, 1996, the State Superintendent, Secretary of DOA and Director of the Legislative Fiscal Bureau certified to JFC an amount that they estimated would be required to achieve the 66.7% funding goal for 1996-97. Based on information available at that time, the three agencies indicated that \$3,182.2 million GPR needed to be appropriated in the equalization appropriation for 1996-97. That was \$30 million higher than the funding level contained in the 1995-97 budget. On June 27, 1996, JFC approved the certified amount of \$3,182.2 million as the figure to be appropriated as 1996-97 general school aids.

2. At the time of certification in June, 1996, the three agencies estimated that partial revenues for 1996-97 would equal \$6,050 million. Based on the property tax levies as certified by each school district to the Department of Revenue late in 1996, statewide property tax levies for school purposes for 1996-97 are \$44.1 million higher than estimated in June, 1996, and partial revenues for 1996-97 are \$6,094.1 million, or \$44.1 million greater than the projected \$6,050 million. As a result, state support of K-12 partial revenues will be approximately 66.2%, or \$29.4 million less than the amount necessary to achieve the 66.7% goal.

3. Other major GPR funded programs such as shared revenue, medical assistance and the University of Wisconsin are provided a specific level of GPR funding. For these programs, a funding level is established once every two years in the budget process. If subsequent adjustments are needed, funding can be provided in separate legislation. While funding 66.7% of partial school revenues represents a commitment of approximately 39% of the state's total general fund budget for 1996-97, the administration argues that the two-year budget cycle used for most other state programs would be adequate for equalization aids as well.

4. It could be argued that the current estimating process would provide a more accurate and impartial estimate of the state's cost of achieving the 66.7% goal of partial school revenues, compared to the Governor's recommendations. Under current law, three independent agencies jointly certify to JFC, on an annual basis, an estimate of the amount necessary to fulfill the state's commitment.

5. On April 25, 1997, the Legislative Council Special Committee on the School Aid Formula voted to recommend that the state continue to provide equalization aid through a sum sufficient appropriation rather than an annual sum certain appropriation as proposed by the Governor. The Special Committee also voted to recommend that the current annual procedure for adjusting the amount of funding necessary for the equalization aid appropriation be retained, rather than eliminating this process as proposed in SB 77. In an April 24, 1997, letter to the Co-Chairs of JFC, the Senate Education Committee made the same recommendations.

## ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to modify the current equalization aid appropriation from a sum sufficient to an annual sum certain. In addition, delete the current statutory procedure for establishing the funding level for equalization aid. Instead, provide that by February 15, 1999, and biennially thereafter, the Governor would submit an estimate to JFC of the amount needed in the following biennium to ensure that the sum of state school aids and the school levy tax credit equals two-thirds of partial school revenues.

2. Maintain current law.

*No Vote Needed*

Prepared by: Bob Soldner

MO# \_\_\_\_\_

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ ABS \_\_\_\_\_

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Delete Primary Hold Harmless Provision on Equalization Aids

Motion:

Move to delete the current law hold harmless provision on primary aid under the state's equalization aid formula as well as the current law special adjustment aid.

Note:

This motion would modify the current law equalization aid formula to repeal the hold harmless on primary aid, which would result in the redistribution of aid at the primary aid level from certain higher-value districts to other school districts. The motion would also repeal special adjustment aids, which otherwise would limit the amount of aid a school district could lose compared to the prior year.

MO# 3228

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COGGS	<del>Y</del>	N	A

BURKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
DECKER	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	<del>Y</del>	N	A
WINEKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COWLES	Y	<del>N</del>	A
PANZER	Y	<del>N</del>	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director  
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

## ISSUE

### **Two-Thirds Rather Than 66.7% State Support (DPI)**

[LFB Summary: Page 464, #5]

## CURRENT LAW

Under current law, by each June 15, the Departments of Public Instruction and Administration and the Legislative Fiscal Bureau must jointly certify to the Joint Committee on Finance (JFC) an estimate of the amount necessary in the equalization aid appropriation which, when combined with categorical school aid appropriations and the school levy tax credit, would achieve 66.7% of partial school revenues in the following school year. Partial school revenues is the sum of state school aids, which is the sum of general and categorical school aids, and gross property taxes levied for school districts. By June 30, JFC must approve the amount to appropriate as equalization aid.

## GOVERNOR

Replace the current statutory goal of 66.7% of partial revenues with a goal of "two-thirds" of partial school revenues. This modification would result in an annual reduction of 0.05%, or approximately \$2.1 million in 1997-98 and \$2.2 million in 1998-99, from the funding required for equalization aid under current law.

## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The administration argues that the current goal of 66.7% of partial school revenues is commonly referred to as "two-thirds funding." The SB 77 provision would align the statutory goal of 66.7% with common usage, which is equivalent to 66.666...%. In their view, there is little reason for the state to pay the additional cost of attaining a 66.7% goal, if the goal is considered to be "two-thirds" funding.

2. On April 25, 1997, the Legislative Council Special Committee on the School Aid Formula voted to recommend that the current statutory goal of 66.7% be retained, rather than the Governor's proposal to change the goal to "two-thirds".

3. If the Governor's proposal would be deleted, it is estimated that this modification would increase the state's cost of funding partial school revenues by approximately \$2.1 million in 1997-98 and \$2.2 million in 1998-99.

## ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to replace the current statutory goal of 66.7% of partial school revenues with a goal of "two-thirds" of partial school revenues, which would reduce the cost for equalization aids, of meeting the goal by an estimated \$2,100,000 in 1997-98 and \$2,200,000 in 1998-99, compared to current law.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$4,300,000
[Change to Bill]	\$0

2. Maintain current law, which would increase costs for equalization aids, compared to the bill by an estimated \$2,100,000 in 1997-98 and \$2,200,000 in 1998-99.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$0
[Change to Bill]	\$4,300,000

Prepared by: Bob Soldner

MO# Alt #1

JENSEN	X	N	A	BURKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	X	N	A	DECKER	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A	GEORGE	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A	JAUCH	X	N	A
GARD	X	N	A	WINEKE	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A	SHIBILSKI	X	N	A
LINTON	X	N	A	COWLES	X	N	A
COGGS	Y	<del>N</del>	A	PANZER	X	N	A

AYE 13 NO 3 ABS

<p>To: Joint Committee on Finance</p> <p>From: Bob Lang, Director Legislative Fiscal Bureau</p>
---

## ISSUE

### **School District Revenue Limits -- School Districts with Changes in Pupil Enrollments (DPI)**

## CURRENT LAW

For purposes of the state's school district revenue limit, a three-year rolling average of a school district's pupil enrollment is used to determine the allowable revenue increase for that district. The number of pupils is based on the average of a school district's membership count taken on the third Friday in September for the current and two preceding school years. For example, the average of the 1993, 1994 and 1995 September memberships was used to calculate the 1995-96 base year revenues per pupil. Then, the average of the 1994, 1995 and 1996 September memberships is used to determine the allowable revenue increase in 1996-97.

Only those pupils who are residents of the district are counted for membership purposes. Pupils who transfer between school districts under the integration (Chapter 220) program are counted in the membership of the sending district and not the receiving district. In addition, pupils participating in the Milwaukee parental choice program are excluded from the membership of the Milwaukee Public Schools when computing the District's revenue limit.

## GOVERNOR

No provision.

## DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Approximately 66% of school districts increased membership from the 1995 to the 1996 third Friday in September pupil count for purposes of the school district revenue limit calculations. Specifically, 283 school districts gained, 138 school districts lost and five school districts had no change in membership. The one-year changes ranged from a 19.35% increase to a 19.39% decrease.

2. For purposes of revenue limit calculations, two separate three-year rolling averages are used to calculate a district's maximum revenues. The three-year rolling averages are used, instead of a one-year change, to lessen the impact on school district budgeting that an annual change could cause. Under the 1996-97 calculations, the changes in the three-year rolling averages ranged from a 13.95% increase to a 6.99% decrease.

3. Some have argued that a five-year rolling average should be used for purposes of calculating revenue limits. The proponents have argued that five-year rolling averages would allow school districts more opportunity to plan and react to changing memberships. Opponents would argue that a three-year rolling average allows ample opportunity for districts to react to changing memberships and moving to five-year rolling averages would only delay a district's need to make decisions.

4. On April 24, 1997, the Senate Education Committee sent a letter to the Co-Chairs of JFC indicating that the Senate Education Committee supports some adjustment for declining enrollment school districts. The Senate Committee identified a four-year or five-year rolling average as a possibility. Based on the 1996-97 revenue limit calculations, including the \$206 per member increase and prior to other allowable adjustments, a five-year rolling average would increase maximum revenues by approximately \$8.0 million. Specifically, 250 school districts would gain \$15.4 million and 176 school districts would lose \$7.4 million. The state's cost of this increase, under the goal of funding 66.7% of partial school revenues, would be approximately \$5.3 million.

5. On April 29, 1997, the Legislative Council Special Committee on the School Aid Formula recommended that an 85% hold harmless provision be incorporated into the revenue limit calculations designed to protect declining enrollment districts. The proposal would specify that if the three-year rolling average used for revenue limits results in a loss of membership for a school district, then the district could retain 85% of the membership lost for purposes of calculating its allowable revenue increase. Although the membership count would revert to its actual level the next year, this higher revenue amount would carry forward, because the base revenue for the next year would reflect the higher maximum revenue generated under the 85% hold harmless provision.

This proposal would provide substantial support to districts with declining enrollment. However, one disadvantage of this proposal would be that a district that experienced a decline

in enrollment in one year and an offsetting increase in the next year, would end up with higher allowable revenues per pupil than if the district had stable membership. This could create an undesirable incentive for school districts to manipulate their fall membership counts for revenue limit purposes.

6. The Committee could adopt modifications that would adjust school district three-year rolling average memberships used in calculating revenue limits so that no school district would experience a change (either a decrease or increase) greater than two percent compared to the prior year's count. Based on the 1996-97 revenue limit calculations, including the \$206 per member increase and prior to other allowable adjustments, this alternative would decrease maximum revenues by approximately \$16.65 million. Specifically, 11 school districts would gain \$0.35 million and 148 school districts would lose \$17.0 million. Districts with significant declines in membership would gain under this option, and districts with larger gains in membership would lose under this alternative. The state's share of this decrease in maximum revenues, under the goal of funding 66.7% of partial school revenues, would be a reduction of approximately \$11.11 million.

## ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Adopt a five-year rolling average for purposes of calculating school district revenue limits, effective July 1, 1998. It is estimated that this modification would cost approximately \$5.3 million in 1998-99 for additional equalization aids.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$5,300,000
[Change to Bill]	\$5,300,000]

2. Provide that if a school district's three-year rolling average pupil enrollment changes by more than 2% compared to the prior year three-year rolling average, then its allowable maximum revenues would be calculated as if the change had been 2%, effective July 1, 1998. Specify that this provision would apply to one of the following situations:

a. to school districts only with declining enrollment; provide an additional \$230,000 in 1998-99 for equalization aids.

<u>Alternative 2a</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$230,000
[Change to Bill]	\$230,000]

b. to school districts with both declining and increasing enrollments; delete \$11,110,000 in 1998-99 for equalization aids.

<u>Alternative 2b</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$11,110,000
[Change to Bill]	- \$11,110,000]

3. Maintain current law.

Prepared by: Bob Soldner

MO# \_\_\_\_\_

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ ABS \_\_\_\_\_

*see motion #3249*

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

School District Revenue Limits --  
Declining Enrollment -- Three-Year Declining Hold Harmless Provision

Motion:

Move to provide that if a school district's three-year rolling average pupil enrollment declines by more than 2% compared to the prior year three-year rolling average, then its allowable maximum revenues would be calculated as if the decrease has been 2%, effective only for 1997-98. Provide that beginning in 1998-99 and thereafter a school district that loses enrollment would receive a three-year declining adjustment to revenue limits, in an amount equal to: (a) in year one, a dollar amount equal to the allowable revenues that 75% of the decline in membership would have generated; (b) in year two, a dollar amount equal to the allowable revenues that 50% of the decline in membership would have generated; and (c) in year three, a dollar amount equal to the allowable revenues that 25% of the decline in membership would have generated. After year three, no further adjustment would be provided attributable to the initial decline in membership. Specify that these adjustments would be calculated separately from the maximum allowable revenues under the current three-year rolling, average process, and would be provided as non-recurring adjustments. This same process would apply to a membership decline in subsequent years. Provide \$230,000 GPR in 1997-98 and \$2,900,000 in 1998-99 for equalization aids.

Note:

It is estimated that this proposal would require \$0.23 million GPR in 1997-98 and \$2.9 million GPR in 1998-99 for general equalization aids in order to maintain the state's commitment to fund 66.7% of partial school revenues.

[Change to Base: \$3,130,000 GPR]

[Change to Bill: \$3,130,000 GPR]

MO#

*#3249*  
JENSEN ☒ N A  
OURADA ☒ N A  
HARSDORF ☒ N A  
ALBERS ☒ N A  
GARD ☒ N A  
KAUFERT ☒ N A  
LINTON ☒ N A  
COGGS ☒ N A

BURKE ☒ N A  
DECKER ☒ N A  
GEORGE ☒ N A  
JAUCH ☒ N A  
WINEKE ☒ N A  
SHIBILSKI ☒ N A  
COWLES ☒ N A  
PANZER ☒ N A

AYE 11 NO 5 ABS

Motion #3249

## PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

## One-Time Hold Harmless Aid for CHCEBs

## Motion:

Move to provide \$143,100 GPR in 1997-98 to fund a one-time hold harmless provision, which would pay each county handicapped children's education board (CHCEB) the amount by which its aid in 1996-97 was less than its aid in 1995-96. Provide that these payments could be prorated if necessary. Delete an offsetting amount of equalization aids to maintain funding of 66.7% of partial revenues.

#4510  
MO#

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	<del>Y</del>	N	A
HARSDORF	<del>Y</del>	N	A
ALBERS	<del>Y</del>	N	A
1 GARD	<del>Y</del>	N	A
2 KAUFERT	<del>Y</del>	N	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COGGS	Y	<del>N</del>	A

BURKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
DECKER	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GEORGE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
JAUCH	Y	<del>N</del>	A
WINEKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COWLES	<del>Y</del>	N	A
PANZER	<del>Y</del>	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS

## PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

## Driver's Education Programming Eligibility

## Motion:

Move to require school districts to accept home-based educated children into school district administered driver's education courses.

## Note:

Under current law, a school district may, but is not required to, provide supplemental and or shared services in non-required subject areas. A driver's education course is considered a non-required subject area.

MO#

1765

1 JENSEN	<del>Y</del>	N	A
2 OURADA	<del>Y</del>	N	A
HARSDORF	<del>Y</del>	N	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COGGS	Y	<del>N</del>	A

BURKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
DECKER	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GEORGE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
JAUCH	Y	<del>N</del>	A
WINEKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COWLES	Y	<del>N</del>	A
PANZER	<del>Y</del>	N	A

AYE 4 NO 12 ABS

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Hospital Aids

Motion:

Move to provide school districts 100% of the prior year costs of special education for children in hospitals and convalescent homes for orthopedically disabled children.

Note:

Under current law, hospital aid payments are paid from a \$275.5 million annual appropriation for handicapped education aids. If appropriated funds are insufficient to pay the full cost, the statutes direct that the state aid payments be prorated among the eligible recipients. This appropriation has been historically insufficient to cover full costs. It should be noted that costs not reimbursed through categorical aids (including hospital aid) are eligible for state sharing under the general equalization aid formula.

In 1995-96, DPI provided hospital aid payments of 67.4% of total eligible costs for the prior school year (1994-95) to the following school districts: (a) \$126,462 to Madison; and (b) \$82,278 to Wauwatosa. Based on the 1995-96 payments, Madison would have received \$61,167 and Wauwatosa would have received \$42,215 in additional payments if 100% of the costs would have been reimbursed. If this motion is adopted, it would have the effect of redistributing a total of approximately \$100,000 to \$150,000 from other school districts eligible for handicapped aids, to Madison and Wauwatosa.

MO# 3187

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N	<input type="checkbox"/> A
OURADA	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	<input type="checkbox"/> A
HARSDORF	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	<input type="checkbox"/> A
ALBERS	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	<input type="checkbox"/> A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N	<input type="checkbox"/> A
KAUFERT	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	<input type="checkbox"/> A
LINTON	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	<input type="checkbox"/> A
COGGS	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	<input type="checkbox"/> A

BURKE	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	<input type="checkbox"/> A
DECKER	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	<input type="checkbox"/> A
GEORGE	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	<input type="checkbox"/> A
JAUCH	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	<input type="checkbox"/> A
WINEKE	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	<input type="checkbox"/> A
SHIBILSKI	<input type="checkbox"/> Y	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	<input type="checkbox"/> A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N	<input type="checkbox"/> A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N	<input type="checkbox"/> A

Motion #3187

AYE 4 NO 12 ABS

# PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

## Lifetime Teacher Licensing Requirements

### Motion:

Move to create an exception from current DPI administrative rules for persons who hold a lifetime teaching license. This exception would specify that persons over the age of 65 would not be required to remain active in the teaching profession through at least 90 days of service in any given school year and would not be required to complete six semester credits of continuing education courses in order to have his or her teaching license revalidated after five consecutive years of inactivity.

### Note:

A lifetime teaching license issued prior to July 1, 1962, is valid for the lifetime of the holder unless revoked by the State Superintendent. A lifetime license issued on or after July 1, 1962, is valid as long as the holder is active in the teaching profession or unless revoked by the State Superintendent. DPI stopped issuing lifetime licenses on July 1, 1983.

Under current administrative rules, employment in the teaching profession for at least 90 days in a given school year is required to maintain validity of a lifetime license. A lifetime license becomes invalid if, for five or more consecutive years, the holder is not actively employed in the teaching profession. An invalidated license may be revalidated if the applicant satisfactorily completes six semester credits or the equivalent during the five years immediately preceding his or her application for revalidation. A licensee is not required to pay a fee to have his or her license reinstated.

This motion would provide an exception to this current administrative rule requirement for persons over 65 years of age.

MO# 3181

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COGGS	Y	<del>N</del>	A

<sup>2</sup> BURKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
<sup>1</sup> DECKER	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	Y	<del>N</del>	A
WINEKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
SHIBILSKI	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COWLES	Y	<del>N</del>	A
PANZER	Y	<del>N</del>	A

AYE 5 NO 11 ABS

# PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

## Wisconsin Educational Opportunity Program

### Motion:

Move to provide \$121,700 GPR in 1997-98 and \$137,800 GPR in 1998-99 and 3.0 GPR positions beginning in 1997-98 for the Wisconsin Educational Opportunity Program.

### Note:

The Wisconsin Educational Opportunity Program (WEOP) consists of four statewide programs whose primary goal is to assist minority and economically disadvantaged middle school and high school pupils in pursuing postsecondary education. Pupils in all school districts are counseled through seven district offices located in Ashland, Eau Claire, Green Bay, Madison, Racine, Wausau and Milwaukee. There are currently 17.0 employees who advise, counsel, place and recruit pupils that participate in the four programs. In total, \$920,000 GPR was expended in 1995-96 to operate the district offices.

This motion would provide \$121,700 GPR in 1997-98 and \$137,800 GPR for an additional 3.0 GPR positions at the WEOP district offices. The motion would provide a 0.25 program assistant position at each of the following offices: Ashland, Eau Claire, Green Bay, Beloit, Racine and Wausau. The motion would also provide an additional 0.5 program assistant and a 0.5 counselor at Milwaukee, and a 0.5 counselor at Ashland.

[Change to Base: \$259,500 GPR and 3.0 GPR positions]

[Change to Bill: \$259,500 GPR and 3.0 GPR positions]

MO# 4509

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COGGS	<del>Y</del>	N	A

BURKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
DECKER	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	<del>Y</del>	N	A
WINEKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COWLES	Y	<del>N</del>	A
PANZER	Y	<del>N</del>	A

Motion #4509

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

School District Revenue Limits -- Summer School Enrollment

Motion:

Move to permit school districts to count 20% of their full-time equivalent (FTE) summer school enrollment in classes taught by licensed teachers as part of the three-year revenue limit average, beginning with the summer school enrollment count for the 1998-99 school year. Specify that the summer school FTE count would not be added to prior school year enrollment counts. Provide that this would phase in by including 20% of FTE summer school enrollment only in the fall, 1998, membership count in calculating revenue limits in 1998-99. Specify that in 1999-2000, 20% of FTE summer school enrollment would be included in the fall, 1998, and fall, 1999, membership count, and continue to add years in the future. Provide \$3,960,000 GPR in 1998-99 for equalization aids.

Note:

It is estimated that this proposal would cost approximately \$3,960,000 in 1998-99 for general equalization aids in order to maintain the state's commitment to fund 66.7% of partial school revenues. Once the proposal would be fully phased in, the annualized costs would be an estimated \$11.9 million GPR.

[Change to Base: \$3,960,000 GPR]

[Change to Bill: \$3,960,000 GPR]

MO# 3202

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ZGARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COGGS	<del>Y</del>	N	A

BURKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
DECKER	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	<del>Y</del>	N	A
WINEKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COWLES	Y	<del>N</del>	A
PANZER	Y	<del>N</del>	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS

# PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

## Head Start Supplement

### Motion:

Move to provide \$750,000 GPR annually for Head Start state supplemental funding.

### Note:

Since 1991, state grants have been provided as a supplement to the federal Head Start program which provides educational, nutritional, health and social services to low-income, pre-school children and their families. Funds are distributed to federally-designated Head Start agencies, with preference given to those already receiving federal funding, to increase the number of children served by the program. In 1996-97, Wisconsin received approximately \$54 million in federal funding and the state provided \$4,950,000 GPR in supplemental funds for Head Start. This motion would increase the amount of state supplemental funds by \$750,000 GPR annually.

[Change to Base: \$1,500,000 GPR]

[Change to Bill: \$1,500,000 GPR]

#1747  
MO#

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COGGS	<del>Y</del>	N	A

BURKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
DECKER	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	<del>Y</del>	N	A
WINEKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COWLES	Y	<del>N</del>	A
PANZER	Y	<del>N</del>	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS

✓  
Senator George

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Minority Precollege Scholarships

Motion:

Move to reduce the Wisconsin Higher Education Grant (WHEG) program for UW students by \$311,500 GPR annually and increase funding for the minority precollege scholarship program by \$311,500 GPR annually.

MO# 4508

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Elks/Easter Seal Respite Program

Motion:

Move to provide \$75,000 GPR annually for the Wisconsin Elks/Easter Seal Center for Respite and Recreation. Provide that the appropriation would be located under the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) and that DPI would be responsible for distributing the funds to the organization annually.

Note:

The Wisconsin Elks and Easter Seals provide a year-round respite program for children and adults with physical, cognitive and multiple disabilities and their families. The program serves approximately 300 children and adults each year through respite weekends September to May and ongoing one-week sessions during Christmas and throughout the summer. Currently, the program is funded through program fees and private contributions through the Easter Seals. This motion would provide \$75,000 GPR annually distributed by DPI to support this program.

[Change to Base: \$150,000 GPR]

[Change to Bill: \$150,000 GPR]

MO# 1742

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	<del>Y</del>	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COGGS	<del>Y</del>	N	A

2 BURKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
1 DECKER	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	<del>Y</del>	N	A
WINEKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
SHIBILSKI	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COWLES	Y	<del>N</del>	A
PANZER	Y	<del>N</del>	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS

Representative Harsdorf

## UW SYSTEM

### UW-Milwaukee Evaluation of Pilot Project in Mathematics

#### Motion:

Move to increase the University's general program operations appropriation by \$25,000 GPR annually for UW-Milwaukee to evaluate a pilot mathematics program in the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS). Provide that the additional funding would be removed from the University's base budget after the 2002-03 fiscal year.

#### Note:

This motion would provide \$25,000 GPR annually during the next three biennia for UW-Milwaukee to evaluate the success of a pilot mathematics program at an MPS elementary school. The funds would be used to purchase and score standardized tests and to conduct the evaluation. The additional funding would be removed from the UW System's base budget after the 2002-03 fiscal year.

[Change to Bill: ~~\$50,000 GPR~~]

PR

MO# 2068

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 13 NO 3 ABS



Senator Shibilski

# PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

## School for the Visually Handicapped -- Adult Summer School

### Motion:

Move to provide \$63,500 GPR in 1997-98 and \$64,600 GPR in 1998-99 and 1.5 GPR positions beginning in 1997-98 to restore the length of the adult summer school program from three to five weeks.

### Note:

This motion would provide 1.5 GPR positions and related funding to staff adult summer school at the School for the Visually Handicapped.

[Change to Base: \$128,100 GPR, 1.5 GPR positions]

[Change to Bill: \$128,100 GPR, 1.5 GPR positions]

MO# 3199

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
2 GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Wisconsin Morning Milk

Motion:

Move to provide \$104,300 GPR annually to the Wisconsin Morning Milk school district grant program administered by the Department of Public Instruction (DPI). Delete \$34,800 annually from general equalization aids.

Note:

The Wisconsin Morning Milk program provides state reimbursements to school districts that serve daily milk to low-income children in preschool through grade five and do not participate in the federal special milk program. In 1996-97, 197 public school districts and 34 private schools participated in the program and served 3,801,070 half-pints of milk and 7,297 half-pints of juice at a cost of \$0.1324 per half pint. In 1996-97, \$325,000 GPR was appropriated for this program and schools made claims for approximately \$505,000; therefore, DPI prorated the reimbursements to approximately 64% of the claims. This motion would provide \$104,300 GPR annually for Wisconsin Morning Milk, which would provide for 85% reimbursement of school district claims over the biennium, based on 1996-97 participation rates and costs. Further, this motion would decrease general equalization aids by \$34,800 annually from general equalization aids in order to maintain the state's two-thirds funding of school districts.

[Change to Base: \$139,000 GPR]

[Change to Bill: \$139,000 GPR]

MO#

4501

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	<del>Y</del>	N	A
2 HARSDORF	<del>Y</del>	N	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COGGS	<del>Y</del>	N	A

BURKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
DECKER	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	<del>Y</del>	N	A
WINEKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COWLES	Y	<del>N</del>	A
PANZER	Y	<del>N</del>	A

Motion #4501

AYE 10 NO 6 ABS

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Funding for DPI for Milwaukee Public  
Museum African American History Initiative

Motion:

Move to provide \$50,000 GPR annually in an annual appropriation in DPI to provide a grant to the Milwaukee Public Museum to develop curriculum and exhibits relating to African American history. Require that the Milwaukee Public Museum provide matching funds.

[Change to Base: \$100,000 GPR]

[Change to Bill: \$100,000 GPR]

MO#

4500

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	X	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

recuse

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	X	N	A
GEORGE	X	N	A
JAUCH	X	N	A
WINEKE	X	N	A
SHIBILSKI	X	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	X	N	A

recuse

AYE 10 NO 4 ABS

✓  
Senator George

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Pupil Uniforms

Motion:

Move to provide that all school boards in the state require all pupils to wear school district uniforms beginning in the 1999-2000 school year.

#3223  
MO#

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COGGS	Y	<del>N</del>	A

BURKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
DECKER	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	Y	<del>N</del>	A
WINEKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COWLES	Y	<del>N</del>	A
PANZER	Y	<del>N</del>	A

AYE 1 NO 15 ABS

# PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

## Preschool to Grade Five Program

### Motion:

Move to provide \$333,500 GPR annually for the Preschool to Grade Five (P-5) program.

### Note:

Since 1986-87, grants have supported programs designed to improve the education of preschool through grade five pupils enrolled in school districts with high concentrations of economically disadvantaged and low-achieving pupils. A district receiving a grant must ensure that each elementary school complies with certain requirements regarding class size (no more than 25 pupils per teacher), annual testing in basic skills, 4-year old kindergarten, identification of pupils needing remedial assistance, parental involvement, in-service training and staff evaluations.

Grants are awarded on a competitive basis for a three-year period to elementary schools within a limited number of school districts, based on high numbers of dropouts and low-income pupils. Grants cannot be renewed unless it is determined that the school has met performance objectives jointly established by DPI and the school. The grants are to supplement existing programs and cannot replace funds otherwise available for such programs. In 1996-97, 39 elementary schools in the Beloit, Kenosha, Milwaukee and Racine school districts participated in the P-5 program. The total appropriation in 1996-97 is \$6,670,000 GPR. This motion would provide \$333,500 GPR annually, which represents a 5% increase above the base in each year of the biennium.

[Change to Base: \$667,000 GPR]

[Change to Bill: \$667,000 GPR]

MO#

1743

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COGGS	<del>Y</del>	N	A

BURKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
DECKER	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	<del>Y</del>	N	A
WINEKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COWLES	Y	<del>N</del>	A
PANZER	Y	<del>N</del>	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS

# PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

## Milwaukee Public Schools and State Trust Fund Loans

### Motion:

Move to specify that the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee must, on behalf of the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS), levy taxes equal to the amount required to make principal and interest payments for the state trust fund loan, as specified by MPS in its budget notice to the City of Milwaukee. Direct MPS on an annual basis, by December 31, to transfer to Milwaukee sufficient funds, when accrued interest is considered, to cover the principal and interest payments due in the following year.

### Note:

Under current law, MPS is not authorized to levy taxes. Currently, MPS must adopt a resolution stating its intention to include in its budget submitted to the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee a notice specifying the amount of necessary to pay the principal and interest of the state trust fund loan.

MO# 3182

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS

Representative Jensen  
Senator Burke

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

CESA Leasing Authority

Motion:

Move to modify current law to specify that CESAs could lease equipment for purposes of aiding students with a visual handicap to read.

MO# 3231

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

<sup>2</sup> BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

## PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

### School District Credit Enhancement Program

#### Motion:

Move to create a school district credit enhancement program whereby the state would guarantee repayment of a school district's short-term and long-term borrowing as follows:

(a) Provide that all school districts would be eligible for the program. In order to participate, require school boards to adopt a resolution requesting DPI to make the principal and interest payment and to withhold equalization aid for the purpose of making the payment. Provide that the school board would be required to notify DPI no later than 30 working days before payment is due;

(b) Require DPI to transfer to the paying agency the lesser of an amount sufficient to make the debt service payment or the balance of any funds due the school district under any state education appropriation for the current school year, reduced by the amount of interest charged to the school district by the state;

(c) Require DPI to charge interest to the school district equal to the amount of interest which the state would have accrued had the aid payments been made when scheduled;

(d) Require DPI to reduce school district aid payments by the amount of the debt payment and interest charged by the state;

(e) Specify that the school board could not increase its levy by the amount of the school aid reduction;

(f) Direct a school board under the program to submit a plan to the State Superintendent for approval specifying the measures it would intend to implement to resolve the issues which led to its inability to make the payment and to prevent future defaults. Specify, that if the plan would be approved, the school district would be required to implement the plan; and

(g) Require DOA to obtain a bond counsel opinion and submit DOA's recommendations to the Joint Committee on Finance (JFC) regarding the constitutionality of the proposed program by January 1, 1998. Upon approval of JFC under a 14-day passive review process, the program would become effective.

Note:

The Capital Finance Director indicates that legal research may be required relating to whether such a program would violate Article VIII, Section 3 of the Wisconsin Constitution, which prohibits extension of the State's credit.

The fiscal effect of this program is difficult to determine. The program could reduce district costs by providing lower interest rates to school districts for obtaining both short term and long term borrowing. Total shared costs aidable under the general equalization aid formula could be reduced, which could result in a redistribution of state aids among school districts. At this time, it is not possible to determine a net fiscal effect.

MO# 4507

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	<del>X</del>	N	A
1 HARSDORF	<del>X</del>	N	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
2 KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COGGS	<del>X</del>	N	A

BURKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
DECKER	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GEORGE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
JAUCH	Y	<del>N</del>	A
WINEKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COWLES	<del>X</del>	N	A
PANZER	<del>X</del>	N	A

AYE 5 NO 11 ABS       

4507  
Motion # 3179

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION/UW SYSTEM

Environmental Education Board

Motion:

Move to transfer the Environmental Education Board (EEB), which is currently attached to the Department of Public Instruction (DPI), to the UW System. Provide for the transfer, from DPI to the UW System, of all assets and liabilities, tangible personal property including records, pending matters and contracts primarily related to EEB, as determined by the Secretary of Administration. Provide that all rules promulgated by DPI and all orders issued by DPI in effect on the effective date of the transfer that are primarily related to EEB would remain in effect until their specified expiration date or until amended or repealed by the Board of Regents of the UW System.

Provide for the transfer from DPI's budget to the UW System's budget, of \$229,700 GPR and \$230,000 SEG annually and 0.5 GPR position beginning in 1997-98, for environmental education grants and administrative costs associated with EEB and the environmental education grant program. ~~Specify that this funding would not count towards the state's goal of funding 66.7% of partial K-12 school revenues.~~

Require the UW-Stevens Point Center for Environmental Education to assist EEB in administering environmental education grants.

---

Note:

The Environmental Education Board, which is currently attached to DPI, provides grants to school districts, private schools, governmental units and nonprofit corporations for the development, dissemination and presentation of environmental education programs. The UW-Stevens Point Center for Environmental Education is required to assist the Board in addressing statewide teacher training needs in environmental education and DPI is required to assist the Board in administering grants. Grants are currently funded through two appropriations within DPI: an annual GPR appropriation (\$200,000 annually under SB 77); and a continuing segregated appropriation (\$30,000 annually under SB 77). The appropriations currently count toward the

state's goal of funding 66.7% of partial K-12 school revenues. The segregated funds are derived from the environmental fund. In addition, EEB is required to seek private funds for grants.

Recent action taken by the Joint Committee on Finance provided \$200,000 SEG annually from the forestry account for the Board to award grants for forestry-related environmental education programs. In 1996-97, \$29,700 GPR and 0.5 GPR position is allocated for administrative activities associated with the Board and the grant program.

This motion would transfer the attachment of EEB, as well as all funding and positions associated with the grant program and administration of the grants, from DPI to the UW System. The motion would transfer all assets and liabilities, tangible personal property, pending matters, contracts and rules and orders which are primarily related to EEB, as determined by the Secretary of DOA, from DPI to the UW System. The motion would require the UW-Stevens Point Center for Environmental Education to assist EEB in administering the grants. The total amount transferred from DPI to the UW System for environmental education grants under the motion would be as follows: \$200,000 GPR annually; \$200,000 SEG annually from the forestry account; and \$30,000 SEG annually from the environmental fund. In addition, the motion would transfer \$29,700 GPR and 0.5 GPR position for administration. Of this amount, \$16,700 is provided for the salary and fringe benefits for the 0.5 position and \$13,000 is provided for supplies and services.

MO#

#2102

JENSEN	X	N	A
OURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
GARD	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A
LINTON	X	N	A
COGGS	X	N	A

BURKE	X	N	A
DECKER	X	N	A
GEORGE	Y	X	A
JAUCH	X	N	A
WINEKE	X	N	A
SHIBILSKI	X	N	A
COWLES	X	N	A
PANZER	X	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS

## PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

### Move DPI Staff to Milwaukee, Purchase of Sinai Samaritan Hospital

#### Motion:

##### Move to:

- (a) Enumerate the purchase and remodeling of Sinai Samaritan Hospital and provide \$20 million of general obligation bonding for this purpose;
- (b) Specify that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction would be required to maintain an office in Milwaukee, which would be staffed by all the positions currently located at GEF III, except at most 10.0 positions which could be retained in Madison. Provide that this requirement would apply once the Secretary of Administration certifies that suitable state-owned office space is ready for occupancy in Milwaukee; and
- (c) Provide \$900,000 GPR in 1997-98 in the Joint Finance Committee's appropriation for release under s.13.10 of the statutes for office moving and household relocation costs associated with the required move of DPI staff to Milwaukee.
- (d) Specify that this relocation to Milwaukee would not apply to positions subject to transfer from DPI to other agencies under SB 77.

---

#### Note:

This motion would enumerate the purchase and remodeling of the Sinai Samaritan Hospital with a project budget of \$20 million. The motion would require that all DPI positions currently located at GEF III move to Milwaukee, except at most 10 which could remain in Madison.

Staff from the Department of Administration have provided information relating to the potential costs associated with the proposed purchase of the Sinai Samaritan facility. Based on this information from DOA, the facility contains approximately 740,000 rentable square feet. DPI would require approximately 70,000 square feet. If the facility could be purchased for \$17 million, annual debt service would be an estimated \$1.4 million annually over the 20-year life of the bonds. It is estimated that conversion of medical space to Class A office space would cost approximately \$30 per square foot, or an estimated \$2.1 million in remodeling costs for DPI's

space, which could be funded out of bond proceeds. Debt service on this additional borrowing would cost an estimated \$175,000 annually. In addition, building operating costs at \$4.50 per square foot would require \$315,000 of annual funding. Based on these DOA assumptions, at a purchase price of \$17 million, it would cost an estimated \$1,890,000 annually for debt service and facility operating costs associated with the DPI space.

DOA estimates that it could cost \$600 per FTE to move the DPI office to Milwaukee. If 400 FTE positions are moved, this would require \$240,000 of funding. Under current law, the state must provide financial assistance to state employees who are required to move. Using the assumption that 200 employees would choose to move to Milwaukee, an estimated \$620,000 of funding would be needed to fund these costs. In total, estimated move related costs would total \$860,000. The motion would provide \$900,000 GPR in 1997-98 in the Joint Committee on Finance GPR supplement appropriation for this purpose.

Current DOA space rental rates for Class A office space is \$15.10 per square foot. If this facility would be part of the state office space managed by DOA, the costs associated with acquiring and remodeling the space would be incorporated in the DOA space rental account. This could lead to an earlier increase in the DOA charges for office space than would otherwise be the case.

[Change to Base: \$20,000,000 BR, \$900,000 GPR]

[Change to Bill: \$20,000,000 BR, \$900,000 GPR]

MO# 3185

2 JENSEN	<del>Y</del>	N	A
OURADA	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COGGS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
BURKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
DECKER	Y	<del>N</del>	A
/ GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	Y	<del>N</del>	A
WINEKE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	<del>N</del>	A
COWLES	<del>Y</del>	N	A
PANZER	<del>Y</del>	N	A
AYE <u>5</u>	NO <u>11</u>	ABS <u>  </u>	

PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Declining Enrollment -- Revenue Limits

Motion:

Move to provide that if a school district that has an enrollment decline that exceeds 2% of its enrollment (as calculated through the current law three-year average process), then the school district could levy for the amount of revenue loss that would be attributable to the decline in enrollment that exceeds 2%. Specify that this additional levy would not be included in the calculation of partial school revenues for purposes of the goal of state funding of 66.7% of partial school revenues.

MO#

4505

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COGGS	<del>Y</del>	N	A

BURKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
DECKER	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GEORGE	Y	<del>N</del>	A
JAUCH	Y	<del>N</del>	A
WINEKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COWLES	Y	<del>N</del>	A
PANZER	Y	<del>N</del>	A

AYE 6 NO 10 ABS

# PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

## School District Revenue Limits -- Declining Enrollment 85% Hold Harmless

### Motion:

Move to provide that an 85% hold harmless provision be incorporated into the revenue limit calculations designed to protect declining enrollment districts. Specify that if the three-year rolling average used for revenue limits would result in a loss of membership for a school district, then the district would retain 85% of the membership lost for purposes of calculating its allowable revenue increase. Provide \$3,200,000 GPR in 1997-98 and \$6,500,000 GPR in 1998-99 for equalization aids.

### Note:

Under this proposal, the membership count would revert to its actual level the next year, but the higher revenue amount would carry forward, because the base revenue for the next year would reflect the higher maximum revenue generated under the 85% hold harmless provision. It is estimated that this proposal would require \$3.2 million GPR in 1997-98 and \$6.5 million GPR in 1998-99 for general equalization aids in order to maintain the state's commitment to fund 66.7% of partial school revenues.

[Change to Base: \$9,700,000 GPR]

[Change to Bill: \$9,700,000 GPR]

MO# 3203

JENSEN	Y	<del>N</del>	A
OURADA	Y	<del>N</del>	A
HARSDORF	Y	<del>N</del>	A
ALBERS	Y	<del>N</del>	A
GARD	Y	<del>N</del>	A
KAUFERT	Y	<del>N</del>	A
LINTON	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COGGS	<del>Y</del>	N	A

BURKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
DECKER	<del>Y</del>	N	A
GEORGE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
JAUCH	<del>Y</del>	N	A
WINEKE	<del>Y</del>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<del>Y</del>	N	A
COWLES	Y	<del>N</del>	A
PANZER	Y	<del>N</del>	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS